



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mon' between modern Britain and America. Professor Gayley's is a longer book, and he goes beyond the purely historical aspects of the case, exerting himself to show the fundamental unity of the political ideals of our race with the great literary movement of the sixteenth century. His detailed investigation of the personal and intellectual connection between Shakespeare and Hooker and the 'Founders of Liberty in America' appeals largely to technical students of English literature and contains a good deal which will be new to most of them. In *The Tempest* he finds evidences of a closer personal connection with the Virginia colonists than has been usually assumed; in *Troilus and Cressida* he traces the influence of the same articles of Hooker's political creed which guided the incorporators of the American commonwealths. The main truth which he brings out is, however, of universal application: the essential difference between a culture which is indigenous and really ideal and one arbitrarily superimposed upon an artificial political system. In his last two chapters the author's argument reaches a high eloquence. The fundamental necessity of Anglo-American concord he puts in three lines:

'For four generations we have been an independent people. But for six generations before that the intellectual and spiritual strivings of our British compatriots toward truth and freedom were those of the British in America.'

TUCKER BROOKE.

Yale University.

The Pearl: An Interpretation. By ROBERT MAX GARRETT. University of Washington Publications in English. Vol. IV, No. 1. Seattle, April 18, 1918. 45 pp.

Within the past few years much scholarly effort has been expended upon the interpretation of *The Pearl*, but it would seem that the problem has not yet lost its fascination. Professor Garrett, the most recent student to undertake the elucidation of the poem, does not concern himself directly with the question raised by Professor Schofield whether it is to be understood as an expression of personal bereavement or merely as a spiritual allegory. His primary purpose is to supply a new key to the symbolism of *The Pearl* by showing "that this poem has as its central idea the funda-

mental teachings of the Eucharist" (p. 10). Having announced this as his thesis, the author proceeds for sixteen pages to assemble testimony (1) as to the central importance and the inner meaning of the doctrine of the Eucharist in the fourteenth century; (2) as to the prominence of the pearl in the New Testament; and (3) as to the symbolic connection of the pearl with the Eucharist in patristic literature.

"The pearl," Professor Garrett declares, "is par excellence the precious stone of the New Testament."¹ The parable of the Pearl of Great Price was in itself sufficient to establish the pearl as a frequent symbol for Christ. To apply this symbol specifically to the consecrated wafer which represented the body of Christ would seem to be an easy extension of the figure. Professor Garrett lays stress upon the physical resemblances between the Host ("Hostia de frumento sit, rotunda et integra et sine macula") and a pearl which might have suggested this identification.

In point of fact, however, the figure of the pearl was almost never applied to the Host. The only instance of this figure which Professor Garrett has been able to find in the Western Church occurs in the verses of Venantius Fortunatus. The phrase *margaritum ingens* in these verses, by the way, was borrowed by Fortunatus from the *Psychomachia* (v. 873), where, however, it was not used of the Host.

Occasionally Professor Garrett's enthusiasm for pearls betrays him into observations which are somewhat fanciful, as when he remarks: "We are likely to see in the beautifully rounded limbs of children the likeness to pearls, in sheen and in color, in purity and in perfectness of form" (p. 24). The main criticism, however, which is to be passed upon these introductory sections of his discussion is that he overstrains the evidence in seeking to show that in patristic literature "the consecrated Host is the great Pearl of the sacred body of the Lamb" (p. 25).

Having completed his survey of the symbolism of the pearl in the Scriptures and in the Fathers, Professor Garrett proceeds to examine the Middle English poem in the endeavor to establish his thesis that its central theme is the Eucharist. Seven pages are devoted to a summary of the argument of the poem, but even this

¹The further statement that "in the Old Testament the pearl does not occur at all" (p. 17) is inaccurate: see *Proverbs* 25, 12.

detailed summary does not enable the reader to perceive that the Eucharist plays any conspicuous part in the poet's plan. Indeed, the only explicit reference to the Eucharist occurs in the last half dozen lines of the poem (vv. 1205-1212). This passage, which is crucial to his argument, Professor Garrett translates in original fashion: "Upon this mound this lot I got, bowed down with grief for my Pearl, and then I entrusted it (*pis lote*) to God in Christ's dear blessing and memory, that in the form of bread and wine which the priest shows us every day, He gave us the way to become servants of his household and precious pearls unto His pleasure." (p. 32, n. 15).

Several points in this translation call for comment: (1) The antecedent of *hit* in p. 1207 is plainly *perle* and not *lote*: it is the Pearl whom the dreamer commits to God. (2) *Myn* (v. 1208) is the personal pronoun and not the substantive *mune*. (3) *pat* (v. 1209) must depend upon *Kryste* (v. 1208): it is Christ whom the priest exhibits daily in the form of bread and wine. (4) The last two lines have been understood by all previous translators as merely the conventional formula of benediction; emending *gef* to *gyue* in order to make sense of the passage. In any case Garrett's rendering—"He gave us *the way* to become servants of his household"—is unwarranted.

Professor Garrett's whole argument for the Eucharistic doctrine in *The Pearl* leans heavily upon this very dubious piece of translation. When he comes to his final statement of the case he stretches the interpretation of this passage to such an extent that it is positively misleading.

"To recapitulate: Within the frame of a great pearl, the poet sees his lost Pearl in the presence of the Lamb of God, a very member incorporate in the mystical body of Christ; *and she teaches him that through the grace of God as granted in the Eucharist it is given him to become a member of this body*, thus to be forever united with his Pearl as parts of the great pearl, the mystical body of Christ."

The phrases which I have italicized are left wholly without support if one accepts the usual translation of the lines with which the poem concludes. Even according to Professor Garrett's rendering of these lines it is notable that the maiden of the vision, who expounds at such length the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, offers no word of instruction to the dreamer concerning the

mystery of the Eucharist. His perception of this matter does not come until after she has left him.

Nor does one find it easy to accept Professor Garrett's further suggestion as to the origin and setting of the poem:

"I have an idea that the whole poem arose from gazing at the Elevated Host in the hands of the Priest (see frontispiece)—'round, white, like a pearl, the meeting place of heaven and earth—a pearl, Margaret'—something like this would, I think, be the train of thought which would bring the germ of the poem to him. I believe that the poet conceives the poem as taking place within the church where the Pearl might be buried, quite regardless of the convention of the arbor and the grass."

The song which floats to the poet (vv. 19-21) as he thinks of his lost Pearl is surely not "the chanting of the choir," nor is there a reference to the incense of the church service in the mention of the "spices" which spread above the little mound where his lost Pearl rests.

Professor Garrett adds to his study two Appendices. In Appendix A he dissents from Osgood's view that the poet in dating his vision "In Augoste in a hy₃ seysoun" refers to the Feast of the Assumption. He proposes instead the Feast of the Holy Name of Jesus (August 7), the Feast of the Transfiguration (August 6), or the Feast of the First-fruits. On the other hand, "high season" is a term which would much more probably be applied to an important feast such as the Assumption; nor does the fact "that the Virgin gets very little mention in the poem" seem a sufficient reason for excluding this Feast from consideration.

Appendix B is a translation, first printed without name in *The Cowley Evangelist* in 1895, of St. Hilary's letter to his daughter concerning the robe and pearl which he was bringing her from the Prince. This is a singularly beautiful parable which deserves to be more widely known. Professor Garrett has rendered a useful service in making it accessible in this charming translation.

CARLETON BROWN.

University of Minnesota.
